CQ CONGRESSIONAL TRANSCRIPTS Congressional Hearings June 12, 2009

Excerpt from the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Readiness Markup of H.R. 2647, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010

. . .

ORTIZ:

Thank you. We will now proceed to mark up H.R. 2647, the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2010. The members should have before them copies of our subcommittee's mark and directive report language.

Without objection, the first reading of the bill is dispensed. With -- is there any discussion or question on the chairman's mark? This is -- like they say in a foreign country -- wonderful.

If there is no further discussion, the chair lays before the members the text of -- of the mark for consideration. Without objection, the mark is open to amendment at any point.

I ask unanimous consent to call up an en-bloc package of five amendments that have been worked and approved by the majority and the minority with Mr. Forbes and my staff, and they comprise of the following -- the clerk will pass out the amendments, and I think the amendments are being passed right now.

We have an amendment by Ms. Shea-Porter regarding modification of the close instructions for the Paul Doble Reserve Center; an amendment by Mr. Nye directing the GAO to review the criteria for military basing decisions; an amendment by Ms. Bordallo regarding authorizing DOD to enter into an interagency agreement regarding land use management; another amendment by Ms. Bordallo regarding authorization for a pilot program for invasive species management; and an amendment by Mr. Forbes regarding limiting the establishment of Navy outlying fields if a local government body opposes it.

Without objection, the reading of the en-bloc package is dispensed with. Is there any discussion on the en-bloc amendment? These guys are trying to pull somebody's chain to my right.

If not the question on the adoption of amendment offered by the chairman, which are five amendments, so many as are in favor will say "Aye."

Those opposed, "No."

The "ayes" have it, and the amendments are agreed to.

. . .